UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/845,712	05/01/2001	John Todd Bergman	1420.002US1	3823

21186 7590 02/09/2005

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER	
PREVIL, DANIEL	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2636	

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/845,712	BERGMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Daniel Previl	2632	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10/20/2004* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16,18,19 and 27-37* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *33-37* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16,18,19 and 27-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to communication filed on October 20, 2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-12, 27-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pildner et al. (US 5,625,338) in view of Parker (US 6,366,211).

Regarding claim 1, Pildner discloses a receiver to receive a wireless signal from a control panel that receives signals from at least two sensors and that determines whether to send an alarm report to phone interface device, wherein the wireless signal from the control panel encodes information regarding a sensor event monitored by a monitoring station (central monitoring station) (col. 3, lines 9-13) (the control panel has a receiver 6 as well as transmitter 8 and as such, can receive RF signals from any of the components of the security system such as keypad 16, sounder 40 and sensors 50 and control panel send an alarm report to telephone channel 12, the control panel processes logic signals (encode) regarding a fire detector) (col. 3, lines 5-50); a power supply comprising a telephone line (AC power connector 14 and a battery power backup comprising telephone channel 12) (fig. 1, ref. 12, 14, 15).

Pildner discloses every feature of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose a phone port to connect to a telephone line and to receive configuration data from the monitoring station, wherein the phone-interface device including the receiver and the phone port is a device separate than the control panel that receives the signals from the at least two sensors.

However, Parker discloses a phone port (I/O port 32) (col. 3, lines 36-38) to connect to a telephone line (telephone system 28) (col. 3, lines 36-38) and to receive configuration data from the monitoring station, wherein the phone-interface device including the receiver (receiver inherently included in the telco 28) (fig. 1, ref. 28) and the phone port is a device separate than the control panel that receives the signals from the at least two sensors (I/O port 32 is separated from the telco 28) (fig. 1-fig. 2; col. 3, lines 1-43).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of McClure in Parker. Doing so would alert means for notification of a central station quickly or efficiently in case a fire or any event that could endanger people safety as taught by Parker (col. 1, lines 9-18).

Regarding claims 2, 3, 6, Pildner and Parker disclose all the limitations in claim 1 and Parker further discloses a memory to contain data received from the control panel (fig. 2). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of McClure in Parker. Doing so would alert means for notification of a central station quickly

or efficiently in case a fire or any event that could endanger people safety as taught by Parker (col. 1, lines 9-18).

Regarding claims 4, 7, Pildner and Parker disclose all the limitations in claim 1 and Parker further discloses the control panel is too slow to accommodate a second data rate between the phone interface device and the monitoring station (col. 4, lines 33-60). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of McClure in Parker. Doing so would alert means for notification of a central station quickly or efficiently in case a fire or any event that could endanger people safety as taught by Parker (col. 1, lines 9-18).

Regarding claim 5, Pildner and Parker disclose all the limitations in claim 1 and Parker further discloses the controller is to buffer the data in the memory in anticipation of the memory station requesting the data (Fig. 2B). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of McClure in Parker. Doing so would alert means for notification of a central station quickly or efficiently in case a fire or any event that could endanger people safety as taught by Parker (col. 1, lines 9-18).

Regarding claim 8, Pildner discloses a transmitter configured to send the configuration data via a wireless signal to control panel (sensors 50 have their own transmitter 52 and therefore send signals to control panel 4) (fig. 1; col. 3, lines 34-35); wherein the control panel is configured to receive the signals from

the sensor (fig. 1); a power supply comprising a telephone line (AC power connector 14 and a battery power backup comprising telephone channel 12) (fig. 1, ref. 12, 14, 15).

Pildner discloses every feature of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose a phone port configured to connect to a telephone line and to receive configuration data from a monitoring station, wherein the monitoring station monitors a sensor event based on signals generated by a sensor; and the phone-interface device including the transmitter and the phone port is a device separate than the control panel that receives the signals from the sensor.

However, Parker discloses a phone port (I/O port 32) configured to connect to a telephone line and to receive configuration data from a monitoring station (fig. 1), wherein the monitoring station monitors a sensor event based on signals generated by a sensor (fig. 1); and the phone-interface device including the transmitter (transmitter inherently included in telco 28) and the phone port is a device separate than the control panel that receives the signals from the sensor (fig. 1-fig. 2; col. 3, lines 1-43).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Parker in Pildner. Doing so would alert means for notification of a central station quickly or efficiently in case a fire or any event that could endanger people safety as taught by Parker (col. 1, lines 9-18).

Regarding claim 9, Pildner and Parker discloses all the limitations in claim 8 and Parker further teaches a memory store the configuration information for communication to the control panel (fig. 2). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Parker in Pildner. Doing so would alert means for notification of a central station quickly or efficiently in case a fire or any event that could endanger people safety as taught by Parker (col. 1, lines 9-18).

Regarding claim 10, Pildner and Parker disclose all the limitations in claim 8 and Parker further teaches a control panel while the phone port is on hook (volatile memory 18 could turn on/off devices) (col. 3, lines 60-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Parker in Pildner. Doing so would alert means for notification of a central station quickly or efficiently in case a fire or any event that could endanger people safety as taught by Parker (col. 1, lines 9-18).

Regarding claim 11, Pildner and Parker disclose all the limitations in claim 7 and Parker further teaches a control panel while the phone port is off hook (volatile memory 18 could turn on/off devices) (col. 3, lines 60-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Parker in Pildner. Doing so would alert means for notification of a central station quickly or efficiently in case

a fire or any event that could endanger people safety as taught by Parker (col. 1, lines 9-18).

Regarding claim 12, Pildner and Parker disclose all the limitations in claim 8 and Parker further teaches the phone port is to call a designated device to report success or failure of transmission of the configuration data (col. 3, lines 10-17). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Parker in Pildner. Doing so would alert means for notification of a central station quickly or efficiently in case a fire or any event that could endanger people safety as taught by Parker (col. 1, lines 9-18).

Regarding claims 27, 30, Pildner discloses power supply further comprises a battery (fig. 1, col. 3, line 14).

Regarding claims 28, 31, Pildner discloses the power supply is supplied to the phone interface through the phone line and a battery (fig. 1).

Regarding claims 29, 32, Pildner discloses phone interface power is different from a power supply of the control panel (the control panel is electrically connected to AC power supply inherently different from the telephone channel 12 power supply) (fig. 1; col. 3, lines 18-20)

3. Claims 13-16, 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pildner in view of Parker as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of McClure (US 5,923,731).

Regarding claim 13, Pildner and Parker disclose all the limitations in claim 8 but fail to explicitly disclose the configuration data is tones, said transmitter configured to relay the tones to the control panel via the wireless signal.

However, McClure discloses a phone port to receive tones from a telephone (this circuit allows for the reception of DTMF tones from the telephone line via a handset through jack J4 31) (col. 5, lines 61-65); a transmitter to relay the tones to a control panel via a wireless signal (DTMF transceivers are converted tones for transmission to the alarm company) (col. 5, lines 60-67, col. 6, lines 1-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Parker in Pildner. Doing so would alert means for notification of a central station quickly or efficiently in case a fire or any event that could endanger people safety as taught by McClure (abstract).

Regarding claim 14, Pildner and Parker discloses all the limitations in claim 8 but fail to explicitly disclose the tones are DTMF tones.

However, McClure discloses the tones are DTMF tones (col. 5, lines 61-63).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Parker in Pildner. Doing so would alert means for notification of a central station quickly or

efficiently in case a fire or any event that could endanger people safety as taught by McClure (abstract).

Regarding claim 15, the above combination discloses all the limitations in claim 8 and Parker further teaches the telephone and the telephone part are on the same premises (fig. 1). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Parker in Pildner. Doing so would alert means for notification of a central station quickly or efficiently in case a fire or any event that could endanger people safety as taught by Parker (col. 1, lines 9-18).

Regarding claim 16, the above combination discloses all the limitations in claim 8 and Parker further teaches the telephone is off-premises from the phone-interface device (col. 3, lines 60-65). Therefore, Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Parker in Pildner. Doing so would alert means for notification of a central station quickly or efficiently in case a fire or any event that could endanger people safety as taught by Parker (col. 1, lines 9-18).

Regarding claim 18, Pildner and Parker disclose all the limitations in claim 8 but fail to explicitly disclose the sensor senses a trouble condition at the phone-interface device.

However, McClure teaches a sensor to sense a trouble condition at the phone interface device (a detector detects circumstances such as cut telephone lines and off-hook condition) (col. 2, lines 51-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of McClure in Pildner and Parker. Doing so would alert means for notification of a central station quickly or efficiently in case a fire or any event that could endanger people safety as taught by McClure (abstract).

Regarding claim 19, Pildner and Parker disclose all the limitations in claim 8 but fail to explicitly disclose the trouble condition comprises at least one of phone removal, cover removal, removal from mounting, low battery and power supply trouble.

However, McClure teaches the trouble condition comprises phone line removal (cut telephone lines) (col. 2, line 52).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of McClure in Pildner and Parker. Doing so would alert means for notification of a central station quickly or efficiently in case a fire or any event that could endanger people safety as taught by McClure (abstract).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16, 18-19, 27-37 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 33-37 are allowed.

5. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: In combination with all the limitations in the claim, the prior arts fail to disclose or make obvious: the phone interface device is not fast enough to keep up with the data transfer rate of the data to be transmitted from the phone port, then the data is transferred from the memory to the phone port at a data transfer approximately equal to the data transfer rate of the phone port; if the wireless link is fast enough to keep up with the data transfer rate of the data to be transmitted from the phone port, the data is transferred real time from the control panel to the phone port at the data transfer rate of the data to be transmitted from the phone port; transmit and receive a provisional alarm upon activation of the entry sensor.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kimmel et al. (US 6,281,790) discloses a method and apparatus for remotely monitoring a site.

Peterson (US 6,175,307) discloses a security system with audible link and two-way communication.

Addy (US 5,822,373) discloses a method and apparatus for optimization of wireless communication.

Peterson (US 5,920,270) discloses a security system remote control.

Brunius et al. (US 6,114,955) discloses a system and method for antenna failure detection.

Delmonaco (US 6,052,052) discloses a portable alarm system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel Previl whose telephone number is (571) 272-2971. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Hofsass can be reached on (571) 272-2981. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Daniel Previl

Examiner
Art Unit 2636

DP
January 25, 2005.

JEFFERY HOFSASS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600